

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 2, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action dated September 2, 2003, claims 1-32 were rejected as follows:

- Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 26, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Trovato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,012, hereinafter Trovato);
- Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trovato in view of Harvey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0059379, hereinafter Harvey);
- Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trovato and in view of Bouvier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,276, hereinafter Bouvier);
- Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trovato and in view of Harvey and further in view of Bouvier;
- Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trovato and in view of Harvey and further in view of Dowens (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,114, hereinafter Dowens);
- Claims 19, 21-25 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trovato and in view of Morris (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,784, hereinafter Morris); and
- Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trovato and in view of Dowens.

To the extent any of these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 19, and 26 are independent claims, each of which has been amended to correct a typographical error in the preamble. Applicant respectfully

submits that none of these independent claims is anticipated by Trovato. In particular, the present invention, as recited in the preamble of each of claims 1, 11, 19, and 26, relates to a voice chat room service over one or more telephone networks. Trovato does not teach, nor does it suggest, how a voice chat room service can be implemented over one or more telephone networks. Accordingly, Applicant does not agree with the Examiner that "user" taught by Trovato reads on "caller" recited in claims 1, 11, and 26. Similarly, Applicant does not agree with the Examiner that "user" taught by Trovato reads on "chatter" recited in claim 19.

Dependent claims 30 and 32 have been amended to correct a typographical error. Dependent claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-25, and 30-32 are believed to be allowable due to their dependencies from allowable independent claims.

Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703-770-7696

Date: November 26, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

DANNIE E. MARTIN

By:


Poh C. Chua
Registration No. 44,615

PCC/kmh